Optional Extended-Day Kindergarten (OEK) Report

S.B. 49 (2007)
Section 53A-1a-902

Report of 2008-2009 Program Results

Prepared by the

Utah State Office of Education
Curriculum and Instruction

October 6, 2009

Brenda Hales
Associate Superintendent

Lynne Greenwood
Director of Curriculum and Instruction

Reed Spencer, Program Director
Language Arts Specialist

A comprehensive report of Optional Extended-Day Kindergarten (OEK) activities and expenditures was submitted to the Utah State Office of Education by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs – districts and charter schools). Information from these reports are summarized here into a Question and Answer format.

1. Q. **How were schools selected to offer Optional Extended-Day Kindergarten (OEK) Programs?**

A.   All reported selecting schools with the highest percentage of students qualified for free and reduced lunch.   The average Free and Reduced lunch percentage for selected schools was 52.66%.

2. Q.   **How were students selected for participation in OEK Programs?**

A.   All LEAs reported using screening assessments, given either at the time of the spring kindergarten roundup or in the first five days of the school year.

3. Q.   **How many students were served with OEK funds?**

A.   LEAs reported serving 5,139 students in approximately 250 classrooms.

4. Q.   **How were parents notified that their child had been identified for participation in an OEK program?**

A.   All LEAs reported that the school staff either met with parents individually or sent them a letter describing the opportunity.

5. Q.   **When offered the chance, how many parents chose NOT to have their child participate in the OEK Program?**

A.   61.8% of LEAs reported 0-1% of parents chose not to participate, 32.4% of LEAs reported 2-5% of parents chose not to participate, and 5.9% of LEAs reported that 6-15% of parents chose not to participate.

6. Q.   **Did LEAs maintain a class size in OEK at least equal to that in regular half-day kindergarten?**

A.   LEAs reported class size for both regular half-day kindergarten and OEK programs.   The average was that OEK full-day classrooms were three students smaller than regular half-day classrooms (19 OEK vs. 22 regular half-day).

7. Q.   **What were OEK funds used to pay for?**

A.   72.48% for salary, 24.24% for benefits (totaling 96.72% for personnel), .9% for Professional/ Technical Services, 0% for Travel, 1.82 for Supplies, .14% for Property, and .42% for Other.

8. Q.   **Did LEAs contribute their own funds to the OEK effort?**

A.   Locally contributed funds totaled 86% of OEK funds—for every $100 of OEK funds, LEAs added $86 of their own to support OEK programs.

9. Q.   **Do pre- and post-tests show that the OEK students closed the gap with students in regular half-day kindergarten? Did the extra time on learning make a difference?**

A.   Two kinds of data on student achievement were gathered.

First, LEAs who used a locally developed kindergarten pre- and post-test reported their data in percentage form, allowing the results from multiple LEAs to be aggregated together into a single average. These results are as follows:

	OEK Students	Non-OEK Students	OEK to Non-OEK Gap
Pre-test Average Score	38.1%	54.1%	16.0%
Post-test Average Score	86.7%	92.1%	5.4%

On the pre-test, the OEK student average was 38.1% and the Non-OEK student average was 54.1%, a difference（gap）of 16.0%.

On the post-test, the OEK student average was 86.7% and the Non-OEK student average was 94.17%, a difference（gap）of 5.8%.

The 16.0 point gap was narrowed to a 5.8% gap by the end of the year, thus eliminating 63.7% of the gap.

The OEK students' improvement from pre-test to post-test was 38.1% to 86.7%,
an increase of 48.6%.

The Non-OEK students' improvement from pre-test to post-test was 54.1% to 92.1%,
an increase of 38.0%.
Second, the results of LEAs who administer the Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy Success（DIBELS）were aggregated（16 districts and 1 charter school）. The subtests chosen for this report are the two that have the highest predictive correlations to end of first grade reading: Letter Naming Fluency and Phoneme Segmentation Fluency.

Letter Naming Fluency

	% of Students at Risk		% of Students with Some Risk		% of Students with Low Risk
	OEK	Non-OEK	OEK	Non-OEK	OEK
Beginning of Year	32%	14%	22%	17%	47%
Middle of Year	16%	10%	18%	17%	67%
End of Year	14%	15%	18%	17%	67%

Note that by the end of the year the per cent of students in each category (At Risk, Some Risk, Low Risk) was virtually the same between OEK and Non-OEK students.

Phoneme Segmentation Fluency

	% of Students at Risk		% of Students with Some Risk		% of Students with Low Risk
	OEK	Non-OEK	OEK	Non-OEK	OEK
Middle of Year	17%	10%	16%	14%	64%
End of Year	4%	4%	12%	11%	81%

Again, note that by the end of the year the per cent of students in each category (At Risk, Some Risk, Low Risk) was virtually the same between OEK and Non-OEK students.